DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 068 TM 830 517

AUTHOR Dreger, Ralph Mas[illegible] And Others
TITLE A Standardization o[illegible] the Mooney Problem Check List - College Form.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (Atlanta, GA, March 23-26, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Measures; *Check Lists; Comparative Analysis; *Factor Analysis; Higher Education; Item Analysis; Research Methodology; Standardized Tests; *Test Norms
IDENTIFIERS *Mooney Problem Check List; *Principal Components Analysis; Rotations (Factors Analysis)

ABSTRACT

The Mooney Problem Check List, College Form, was administered to 2,261 students from six Louisiana universities, for standardization purposes. Usable protocols were obtained for 1,929 subjects. Comparisons among schools, school classes, sex, race, and marital status were made for the 11 Mooney categories. Norm tables were developed for all groups with sufficient N's for the categories A component analysis was also done, with 13 components retained for rotation by Varimax and Promax. Comparisons among groups were also made for the 13 factors. Norm tables were likewise developed for sufficiently large groups. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233068

A Standardization of the Mooney Problem Check List - College Form

Ralph Mason Dreger and Patricia Cawunder
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
S. Thomas Elder
University of New Orleans
Donald Gates
Northwestern State University
A. B. Johnson
Southern University, Baton Rouge
George A. Kemp
Louisiana State University, Shreveport
Carolyn Minder
Northeast State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. M. Dreger
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM830517

Running head: Mooney

Abstract

The Mooney Problem Check List, College Form, was administered to 2261 students from six Louisiana universities, for standardization purposes. Usable protocols were obtained for 1929 subjects. Comparisons among schools, school classes, sex, race, and marital status were made for the 11 Mooney categories. Norm tables were developed for all groups with sufficient N's for the categories. A component analysis was also done, with 13 components retained for rotation by Varimax and Promax. Comparisons among groups were also made for the 13 factors. Norm tables were likewise developed for sufficiently large groups.

A Standardization of the Mooney Problem Check List - College Form

In the Manual for the Mooney Problem Check List (Mooney & Gordon, 1950) the authors emphasize that the Check Lists are not tests, that even the count of problems in the several areas and the total number of problems is not a real score: ". . . it should be remembered that this count . . . is not a sum of points of a trait scale or a total of 'maladjusted' choices on some trait key. It is simply a count of the problems which the student has identified as matters of concern to him (Mooney & Gordon, 1950, p. 9, authors' emphasis).

Continuing in this vein, the Mooney authors state that they do not offer a table to permit comparison of a student's count with a normative group, as the earlier edition of the Mooney had provided. (See the Manual for references to the first forms.) Instead, the authors suggest that for comparison purposes local norms are the most valuable. Such may be the case. However, in the more than 30 years since the 1950 revision, there should be some evidence that local norms have been established, but we have been unable to find any such evidence. No doubt there are local norms somewhere, so that after describing norms in a whole state (and thus local in that sense) there will be responses of the sort, "Oh, yes, we have had norms at our counseling center or in our guidance department for many years." Nevertheless, as far as we can determine, no published norms are available.[1]

Because we as counselors and/or administrators have recognized our own needs for norms for the Mooney that go beyond the local universities in which we are located, and others with whom we have communicated have likewise expressed such needs, we have pooled our resources to standardize the

college form of the instrument on a statewide basis. The strengths and limitations of such a standardization are discussed below.

Method

Subjects

Six universities in the State of Louisiana participated in this study. Students primarily in liberal arts, and especially in psychology classes, participated on a voluntary basis. Altogether, 2261 undergraduates and others unspecified were administered the Mooney at their universities by their instructors. Although instructions were given to complete forms anonymously, some students did fill in their names; since these are so few in relation to the hundreds who did respond anonymously, it was not deemed necessary to analyze their data separately.

For reasons of manifest invalidity or incompleteness of records and/or identifying data, 332 protocols were not analyzed for this study, leaving a total of 1929 with complete Mooney responses. Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the sample. Because of varying amounts of such information on the 1929 subjects, in some of the following tables numbers will vary from those in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Include Table 1 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The universities from which subjects were drawn represent all sections of the State except the southwestern (" Cajun country"). One university, the University of New Orleans, has a higher proportion of minority students than any of the others except Southern University in Baton Rougw which is a predominantly black institution. UNO students tend to come from

more Catholic backgrounds than those in the other universities. These institutions, Northwestern State University, Northeast Louisiana University, and LSU in Shreveport represent the more Protestant north of Louisiana and have a smaller proportion of black students than either LSU in Baton Rouge or UNO. Although the samples come from a Deep South state, students in a large number of cases, especially at SU, LSU, and UNO, originate elsewhere. This is not to say that the samples are entirely representative of students across the country. Also, those who know Louisiana will recognize that failure to sample in Acadiana in the southwestern part of the state, a culture unique in its blend of German, Spanish, Black, Indian, and French peoples, means that not all of Louisiana is represented. Nevertheless, the representativeness of the American student population in the student bodies of most of the schools is greater than might be supposed.

Instrument

The College Form of the Mooney Problem Check Lists, 1950 Revision (known as "The Mooney"), consists of a six-page booklet with a face sheet for identifying information and a set of simple instructions, followed by a list of briefly-stated problem items and two pages of open-ended questions. The student responds to the 330 items by underlining those about which he or she feels concern. Items are sampled in Table 5. The items are grouped in 11 categories, as explained in Note g, Table 2. Though not evident from Table 5, the problem areas do not correspond to a major degree with the way responses cohere in actual practice, for factors derived from intercorrelations of items do not generally match the logically derived problem areas. However, our analyses include norms for the categories inasmuch as

counselors are accustomed to using the Mooney problem areas. Following underlining the second step asks the student to go back and circle the problems which trouble him or her most. We have analyzed these items as well.

The third part of the Mooney is a series of four open-ended questions. We have devised a scoring system for these items, but the analyses of them will not be complete for some time yet.

Very few studies can be located in the literature which report using the Mooney. Ayers and Moore (1974), in one of the four predictive investigations of academic achievement utilizing non-intellective variables, found that nine of the Mooney's 11 categories predicted significantly to quality point average in a teacher training program. These categories were not successful in predicting to the National Teacher Examinations.[2] (At least, this appears to be the situation with Pearson r's varying from -.09 to .09.) Wen and McCoy (1975), also using non-intellective variables as predictors in a predominantly black university, reached a similar conclusion to that of Ayers and Moore, that is, that Mooney categories were significantly related to grade point average. This finding was true more for men than for women, in that eight of the categories predicted for men and only two for women. For the men seven of the categories are the same as in the Ayers and Moore study. It should be noted that in every case in both studies the coefficients are negative. Though not large, the fact that they are all negative, as one might expect, speaks well of the Mooney's validity.

Procedure

Forms were distributed by the authors for administration in their respective schools. Written explanation was made to the cooperating instructors as to the voluntary and anonymous nature of the research. All the

information on the face sheet was requested of the student except the individual's name, that is, age, birthdate, sex, race, class in college, marital status, curriculum in which enrolled, and the present date. One error in administration was in not asking for the name of the student's university, for in some cases it was not clear which school the student attended. Such cases could not then be included in the analyses by schools.

All protocols were collected and analyzed at the project headquarters, LSU in Baton Rouge.

Analysis

The first task undertaken was to obtain frequency distributions of responses to all 330 individual items, scored 0=not underlined, 1=underlined, 2=circled. Means, standard deviations, and maximum and minimum scores were computed for Mooney categories and for circled items within categories.

Analyses of variance were also run for normative or descriptive, not inferential, purposes, using the General Linear Model of the Statistical Analysis System (Helwig & Council, 1979), for both the underlined responses and circled responses by sex, school, school class, marital status, and race.

A principal component factor analysis was performed on the 1929-by-330 matrix of Mooney underlined responses. On the basis of previous experience with large matrices, an exploratory 50 components were retained for rotation initially. (The latent-root-of-one criterion yielded 107, an impossible number with which to deal.) Examination of the distribution of eigenvalues for the Scree Test (Cattell, 1966) revealed two scree breaks, one at 13 and one at 26. The former constituted a clearer break, so partly on that account, partly to achieve parsimony, and partly to keep relatively

close to the original 11 logical categories, 13 factors were retained and rotated by Varimax and Promax (with the parameter K set at 4). Three second-order factors were also obtained from the intercorrelations of the first-order factors.

First-order factor scores were computed in this manner: The factor structure matrix was examined for the largest or "most meaningful" weight of a factor on an item variable. By "most meaningful" is meant three things. First, the weight had to be at least of an absolute value of .20, the minimum set for significance. Second, it was not needed for scoring another factor. And third, the item contributed to the meaning of a factor at least as well as the item with the largest weight, the latter item being needed for scoring another factor. Since both Varimax and Promax attempt to achieve "simple structure," only a relatively few weights are not the largest in their respective rows. All other weights were set to zero, so that an item of the test could contribute to only one factor. This "reduced" factor structure matrix was then used to compute factor scores for the 1929 subjects by pre-multiplying it by the matrix of zero-one raw scores. Ideally, these latter should have been standardized to z-scores. However, because of the extreme skewness of a very large proportion of the items, the assumption was made that less distortion would occur utilizing the sero-one matrix than z-scores which assume normality.

Factor scores for the 13 factors were subjected to analyses of variance with independent variables class, school, sex, race, and marital status.

Although by inspection it was evident that the logical categories and

factors did not match very well, an attempt to objectify the comparisons was undertaken by summing the intercorrelations between item raw scores for each category and factor scores for each factor, first for all coefficients and then for coefficients .20 and above, and then transforming these sums into percentage contributions of each category to each factor. This analysis was based on the supposition that sums of raw coefficients would be fully as stable as sums of Fisher's z-scores which are not much different from untransformed r's for smaller values.

Finally, deciles were computed using factor scores for all data combined and for the original 11 Mooney categories individually and in toto. Because of the skewness of the factor scores, deciles were utilized rather than percentages. For the logical categories and the 13 factors deciles were also computed for both sexes for single and married subjects (together, N=1838 of the 1929; less than 100 Others are not sufficient for deciles), for non-white and white subjects, and for single white and single non-white males and females.

Results

Frequency distributions from all 2261 subjects for individual items of the Mooney are not reported here, inasmuch as we are not contemplating an item analysis as if we ourselves were constructing a test; but we will make our distributions available to anyone who might wish, with appropriate permissions, to construct a short form of the Mooney or to deal otherwise with the items.

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and maximum number of items underlined (lower half of table) and circled (upper half of table)

by any one respondent. The TOTC (total circled) and TOT (total underlined) are not the totals of items but are the maximum number of items either circled or underlined (which includes both) by any one respondent. It is evident from a comparison of the means and standard deviations with maxima that the distributions are highly positively skewed, especially for circled items (those especially troubling the respondent).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Include Table 2 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

For the ANOVA, with numbers of item responses as the dependent variable and school, school class, sex, race, and marital status as independent variables, a five percent confidence level was set a priori. Table 3 summarizes the results for circled and underlined items for Mooney categories. The number of significant effects exceeds chance by quite a wide margin, although taking the single row representing sex, with one significant effect, and the Sex by Race row with two significant effects, one might suspect chance to be operative. On the other hand, School (university), School class, and Marital status are most likely showing truly significant effects. It is noteworthy that, although one university provided a very large proportion of nonwhite subjects, the race variable proved significant in no case, so differences among schools are probably not attributable to race. The reader must remember that even the significance tests among means described here are purely descriptive of this normative group. They are only in the form of inferential statistics.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Include Table 3 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

School differences are only of interest to the authors from the several participating schools, so their means are not reported here. For the class and marital status variables, means are reported in Table 4.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Include Table 4 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The most noticeable feature about the means recorded in Table 4 is the similarity from class to class and one marital state to another even where significant differences among or between means do show up statistically but where no practical differences exist. Only where a difference of 1.0 or more scale points is seen can one judge that there is a practical difference; and only a few such are shown in Table 4.

Table 5 lists the names of the 13 factors derived from the component analysis and the most highly weighted items which characterize them. As is well known, names are only the interpretations factor analysts ascribe to the dimension presumably assessed by the variables on which it loads. We have tried to assign names reflecting primarily what the variables loaded most highly suggest to be the meaning of the dimension, but recognize that there are nuances which may not be caught by the name.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Include Table 5 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Those familiar with the format of the Mooney know that items scored in the separate categories, HPD FLE, etc., are arranged in six blocks of five items apiece across the three inner pages of the test booklet. If the categories and factors of the Mooney coincide, all or most of the items identifying a factor should come from one of these sets of category items.

We have matched factor and category items, however, and find that, yes, in many cases whole blocks of some category items also identify factors but in other cases there are items from several blocks identifying factors. Table 5 illustrates this mixed bag, though not as clearly as it shows up when one examines the entire list of significantly (.20 or higher) weighted items. Table 6 gives the more exact relations between categories and factors. By summing the Pearson r's between categories and factors item by item and transforming these sums to percentages it is possible to determine the percentage contribution of any category to any factor. (Correlation coefficients were not transformed to Fisher's z function since there was no intent to make comparisons among coefficients.)

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Include Table 6 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The lower portion of Table 6 presents the more accurate picture of the relation between categories and factors. Categories HPD, SPR, PPR, and MR appear to have no clear one-to-one relation to any factor. Categories FLE, SRA, ACW, FVE, and CTP seem fairly closely related to factors G, D, K, F, and B respectively, while CSM and HF are more doubtfully related to I and C.

Besides obtaining the first-order factors, second-order factors were computed to determine radix-type dimensions underlying the first-order dimensions. Table 7 describes these three more fundamental dimensions. As is our custom in naming and determining the meaning of higher-order factors, we have consulted the item contents of the original factors. Factor I seems to be a general "g" dimension comparable to "g" among intellectual abilities. Factor II derives its name from Shakespeare's "infirm of purpose," inasmuch as the first-order factor item contents indicate that the individual

scoring high on this dimension cannot seem to get down to business because he/she does not have clear goals in mind. Factor III draws on Browning's "A man's reach should exceed his grasp, else what's a heaven for?" The item contents suggest "I'm late, I'm late for a very important date" and impatience with obstacles standing in the way of achieving more or less ideal goals.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Include Table 7 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

No table of means, standard deviations, and maximum scores is offered for factor scores as for Mooney categories (Table 4). The latter are included in this report as referring to familiar material to regular users of the Mooney. With the factor scores being unfamiliar to users it seems to us to be a waste of space to include a similar table, and instead offer the decile tables described below. However, if the omitted table is needed by someone, it can be supplied upon request.

Table 8 contains the results of the analysis of variance of factor scores for the 13 first-order factors. The same story is told here as in the case of the Mooney categories (Table 3). Universities and classes differ among themselves and individuals of differing marital status differ from one another on a number of factors. Race and sex virtually have no influence on factor scores except in the case of factor D, "Pressures of Time," on which females score significantly higher than males (and in fact, the male mean is less than three-fourths the female mean).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Include Table 8 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Decile norm tables for both categories and factors for the following groups have been compiled and may be obtained from the first author:

Entire sample	White
Males	Single, non-white females
Females	Single, non-white males
Single	Single white females
Married	Single, white males
Non-white	

These are the basic norm tables for use with individuals or groups with similar characteristics to those described for the standardizing sample.

Discussion

The most obvious weakness of this normative study is that it was confined to one state. It should ideally have sampled from colleges and universities throughout the nation, wherever the Mooney is used. Caution needs to be observed, therefore, in applying the norms to populations not sharing the characteristics of our sample. The latter does not include Mejicanos, at least in any number that would be meaningful; the same is true of Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Native Americans. The lack of representation from the "Cajun country" of Louisiana was pointed out in the Subjects Section above. (This omission was not an oversight but resulted from failure on our part to obtain cooperation.) Nevertheless, with these restrictions, and possibly some relating to other special populations, the sample we do have is not entirely unrepresentative of the general American college populace in view especially of the cosmopolitan nature of the New Orleans and Baton Rouge campuses (both SU and LSU).

Even if the sample were considerably more restricted than it actually is, however, the fact that norms ("local norms") are offered here in itself appears to be a contribution to counselors who use or might use the Mooney. We repeat what we stated at the beginning: As far as we know, no "local norms" have been published. Here, then, are local norms, which in fact are not as local as they might at first seem to be.

A second possible weakness of this study is that we have accepted frequency counts of responses to the Mooney categories as "scores" on the 11 categories and treated them as such, applying standard statistical methods to them. Although Mooney and Gordon warn against considering such counts as scores on traits, the very format of the test booklet invites such usage; and from our experience and observation we judge that that is the manner in which users of the Mooney view them, that is, as scores on categories. However, we have not limited our treatment of our Mooney data to the categories; instead, we have actually constructed scales by factor analyzing these data and establishing scales for the 13 factors. Most users will probably utilize the category norms; but the factor score norms are also available which do not suffer from the psychometric inadequacies of the category norms.

As far as we can tell, only one other factor analysis of the Mooney has been reported; and it was done with the High School form. It is interesting to compare the results of Stewart and Deiker's (1976) factoring with ours. With 173 emotionally disturbed, 134 delinquent, and 273 normal adolescents, these investigators found only one large general factor from five analyses. Since the High School Form items are grouped into the same

categories as those in the College Form, it is difficult to understand why at least a few more factors were not produced from the exceedingly diverse contents. At least, one global score on a general factor, however justified it may be from a psychometric viewpoint, has limited usefulness.

To be sure, the usefulness of the norms produced in the present standardization of the Mooney Problem Check List, College Form, has yet to be proved as well.

References

Ayers, J.B., & Rohr, M.E. Relationship of selected variables to success in a teacher preparation program. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1974, 34, 933-937.

Cattell, R.B. The scree test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1966, 1, 245-276.

Helwig, J.T., & Council, K.A. SAS user's guide, 1979 edition. Raleigh, N.C.: SAS Institute, Inc., 1979.

Merwin, J.C. Review of the National Teacher Examinations. In O.K. Buros (Ed.), The eighth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1978.

Mitchell, J.V., Jr. Review of the National Teacher Examinations. In O.K. Buros (Ed.), The eighth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1978.

Stewart, D.W., & Deiker, T. An item factor analysis of the Mooney Problem Check List. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1976, 36, 509-513.

Wen, S-S., & McCoy, R.E. Relationships of selected nonacademic and academic variables to the grade point average of Black students. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1975, 35, 935-939.

Footnotes

Reprints of this article may be obtained from

Ralph Mason Dreger

Department of Psychology

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

[1]We are indebted to Dr. Kim Van Geffen for the literature search. The Psychological Corporation, publishers of the Mooney, although understandably not willing to release precise sales figures, has estimated that somewhere in the neighborhood of 50,000 persons are tested each year with the various forms and that the widest usage is in college counseling centers. Personal Communication, Lois E. Burrill, Manager, Information and Advisory Services. We wish to express our thanks to Ms. Burrill for proffering the above information.

[2]The first author of the present article is sceptical about the NTE's value as a measure of effectiveness, so the failure of the Mooney to predict to the NTE does not trouble him. The NTE appears to have everything going for it except validity. Cf. Merwin (1978) and Mitchell (1978).

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Standardizing Sample N = 1929

By School	N
Louisiana State University (Baton Rouge & Shreveport)	605
Northeast Louisiana University	648
Northwestern State University	270
Southern University	240
University of New Orleans	346
Unknown	152
	2261
By Sex[a]	
Male	650
Female	1258
Unknown	21
	1929
By Race[a]	
Non-white	161
White	758
Unknown	1010
	1929
By Marital Status[a]	
Single	1539
Married	299
Other	65
Unknown	26
	1929

Table 1 (Continued)

	By Age[b]
50 & above	6
40 - 49	24
35 - 29	37
30 - 34	58
25 - 29	172
23 - 24	126
22	120
21	219
20	385
19	529
18	421
17	131
Below 17	6
Unknown	27
	2261

[a]By self report of individuals with complete protocols.

[b]By self report from the majority of total sample.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Maximum Values for Mooney Categories by Total Sample, Sex, Race, and Marital Status

Category	Total Sample[a]			Sex[b]					
				Male			Female		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	Max[e]	$\bar{X}$	SD	Max	$\bar{X}$	SD	Max
HPDC[f]	1.3	1.89	14	0.9	1.62	14	1.5	1.99	14
FLEC	1.5	2.28	15	1.3	2.32	15	1.5	2.27	15
SRAC	1.5	2.30	20	1.2	2.12	16	1.6	2.39	20
SPRC	1.5	2.41	20	1.1	2.08	20	1.7	2.56	19
PPRC	1.8	2.65	24	1.3	2.17	23	2.0	2.83	24
CSMC	1.4	2.15	19	1.1	1.91	13	1.5	2.27	19
HF C	1.2	2.02	19	0.9	1.73	15	1.4	2.14	19
MR C	1.3	2.02	16	1.2	1.97	16	1.4	2.05	15
ASWC	2.1	3.02	22	2.0	2.98	22	2.2	3.06	22
FVEC	1.4	2.11	17	1.1	1.84	13	1.5	2.24	17
CTPC	1.0	2.16	21	0.8	1.73	16	1.2	2.34	21
TOTC	16.0	18.97	181	13.0	16.75	134	17.6	19.92	181
HPD[g]	3.8	2.90	17	3.0	2.68	17	4.2	2.94	17
FLE	4.0	3.78	24	3.8	3.95	24	4.1	3.68	20
SRA	5.0	4.23	24	4.2	3.87	22	5.3	4.36	24
SPR	4.3	4.29	27	3.4	3.13	27	4.7	4.46	27
PPR	5.0	4.54	29	3.9	4.17	29	5.5	4.64	27
CSM	3.3	3.40	21	2.9	3.23	17	3.5	3.46	21
HF	3.1	3.24	21	2.4	2.82	18	3.4	3.39	21
MR	3.6	3.44	20	3.4	3.39	19	3.7	3.47	20
ASW	6.0	4.80	27	5.8	4.95	26	6.1	4.74	27
FVE	3.8	3.83	27	3.4	3.71	23	3.9	3.89	27
CTP	3.6	3.92	27	3.2	3.66	25	3.9	4.04	27
TOT	45.3	31.48	194	39.4	29.66	194	48.3	32.00	182

[a]N = 2221

[b]M Male N = 746; Female N = 1447.

[c]Nonwhite N = 203; White N = 866. The majority did not indicate race.

[d]Single N = 1757; Married N = 350.

[e]Maximum number of items endorsed in any category and in the total test.

[f]Circled items, i.e., those problems especially troubling to respondent.

[g]Underlined items, i.e., those problems troubling to the respondent. Number includes circled items. Categories are: HPD = Health and Physical

Table 3

Significance Levels of Analysis of Variance of Responses in Mooney Categories and Totals by School, Class, Sex, Race, and Marital Status

Variable	Category[a]											
	HPD	FLE	SRA	SPR	PPR	CSM	HF	MR	ASW	FVE	CTP	Total
	Circled											
School	.0001	.0001	.0072		.0035		.0016	.0004	.0019	.0057	.0001	.0001
Class	.0499	.0541							.0386	.0152	.0118	
Sex												
Race												
Marital						.0002	.0169	.0407				
Sex x Race												
Sex x Marital												
Race x Marital												
S x R x M												
	Underlined											
School		.0001								.0042	.0454	
Class		.0305							.0054	.0073	.0001	
Sex			.0201									
Race												
Marital		.0156		.0482	.0187	.0001	.0006	.0304			.0187	.0164
Sex x Race		.0275				.0107						
Sex x Marital												
Race x Marital												
S x R x M												

[a]See Table 2 for Mooney categories.

Table 2 (Continued)

Category	Race[c]						Marital Status[d]					
	Non-white			White			Single			Married		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	Max	$\bar{X}$	SD	Max	$\bar{X}$	SD	Max	$\bar{X}$	SD	Max
HPDC[f]	1.8	2.33	14	1.2	1.89	11	1.3	1.89	14	1.2	1.88	14
FLEC	2.0	2.53	14	1.3	2.19	15	1.5	2.28	15	1.2	2.08	15
SRAC	1.9	2.52	14	1.4	2.32	17	1.5	2.30	20	1.4	2.30	16
SPRC	2.1	2.79	15	1.5	2.59	19	1.6	2.43	17	1.1	2.25	20
PPRC	2.5	3.23	15	1.6	2.57	20	1.8	2.60	24	1.7	2.85	23
CSMC	2.0	2.78	16	1.4	2.17	19	1.6	2.27	19	0.4	1.03	8
HF C	1.7	2.50	19	1.2	2.05	15	1.3	2.10	19	0.8	1.48	10
MR C	1.9	2.77	16	1.3	2.03	13	1.4	2.07	16	1.1	1.73	11
ASWC	2.7	3.30	17	2.1	3.10	22	2.2	3.00	22	1.9	3.10	22
FVEC	1.7	2.61	16	1.1	1.98	16	1.4	2.13	17	1.3	2.02	16
CTPC	1.6	2.54	12	0.9	1.96	18	1.1	2.17	21	1.0	2.08	13
TOTC	21.8	24-	139	15.0	18.60	137	16.5	19.22	181	13.2	16.98	134
HPD[g]	4.2	3.04	14	3.4	2.65	15	3.8	2.94	17	3.7	2.75	17
FLE	4.9	4.07	22	3.3	3.38	21	4.1	3.75	24	3.2	3.56	21
SRA	4.8	3.91	18	4.5	4.05	24	5.0	4.24	24	4.6	4.16	22
SPR	4.9	4.30	19	4.2	4.31	27	4.5	4.32	27	3.3	4.10	27
PPR	5.5	4.64	18	4.5	4.19	27	5.1	4.56	27	4.3	4.43	29
CSM	4.2	3.92	16	3.3	3.32	21	3.7	3.45	21	1.0	1.71	14
HF	3.8	3.77	19	2.9	3.05	17	3.3	3.34	20	1.9	2.39	31
MR	4.1	3.52	18	3.5	3.36	19	3.8	3.49	20	3.0	3.25	18
ASW	6.2	4.50	19	5.7	4.58	23	6.1	4.75	26	5.6	5.16	27
FVE	3.9	3.93	18	3.1	3.40	23	3.8	3.84	27	3.5	3.82	25
CTP	4.2	4.03	17	3.0	3.49	23	3.8	3.98	27	3.0	3.64	23
TOT	50.9	34.44	155	41.4	28.84	182	47.0	31.70	182	37.1	28.74	194

Development; FLE = Finances, Living Conditions, and Employment; SRA = Social and Recreational Activities; SPR = Social Relations; PPR = Personal Psychological Relations; CSM = Courtship, Sex, and Marriage: HF = Home and Family; MR = Morals and Religion; ASW = Adjustment to School Work; FVE = The Future: Vocational and Educational; CTP = Curriculum and Teaching Procedure.

Table 4

Mean Responses in Mooney Categories and Totals by

School Class and Marital Status

Variable	Category[a]											
	HPD	FLE	SRA	SPR	PPR	CSM	HF	MR	ASW	FVE	CTP	TOTAL
						Circled						
Class												
Freshman	1.0[b]	1.2[b]	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.1	2.0[b]	1.0[b]	0.7[b]	13.5
Sophomore	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.9	1.1	1.0	13.8
Junior	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.1	2.1	1.5	1.0	15.5
Senior	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.8	1.5	0.8	14.2
Other	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.2	1.7	0.8	0.8	1.1	1.6	1.2	1.0	13.5
Marital												
Single	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.4[b]	1.2[b]	1.2[b]	2.0	1.2	0.9	14.5
Married	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.5	0.4	0.6	1.0	1.9	1.3	0.9	12.2
Other	1.1	2.5	1.6	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.0	0.7	1.8	1.0	0.6	14.8
						Underlined						
Class												
Freshman	3.5	3.5[b]	4.5	4.5	4.9	3.4	3.2	3.4	6.0[b]	3.2[b]	2.7[b]	42.7
Sophomore	3.7	4.1	4.9	3.9	4.7	3.3	3.1	3.6	6.0	3.5	3.8	44.5
Junior	3.9	4.3	5.3	4.6	5.3	3.2	3.0	3.7	6.4	4.3	4.1	48.1
Senior	3.8	3.8	5.3	4.2	4.8	3.1	2.9	3.7	5.6	4.6	3.6	45.3
Other	3.5	3.2	4.3	3.2	4.4	1.9	2.1	3.0	4.3	2.9	3.0	35.9
Marital												
Single	3.7	4.0[b]	4.9	4.4[b]	5.0[b]	3.7[b]	3.3[b]	3.7[b]	6.0	3.8	3.7[b]	46.2[b]
Married	3.6	3.2	4.7	3.3	4.2	0.9	1.8	2.9	5.6	3.5	3.0	36.9
Other	3.5	6.0	5.8	4.0	5.2	3.2	2.7	2.4	5.5	3.2	2.4	44.0

[a]See Table 2 for Mooney categories. [b]Significant differences. See Table 3.

Table 5

Factors Derived from the Mooney

Problem Check List

Item No.	Factor Structure Weight		Mooney Category
Factor A.		Feelings of Inferiority	
243	.58	Lacking self-confidence	PPR
129	.54	Worrying how I impress people	SPR
130	.54	Feeling inferior	SPR
18	.48	Being ill at ease with other people	SPR
Factor B.		College Inequities	
105	.62	Teachers not considerate of students' feelings	CTP
164	.59	Teachers lacking interest in students	CTP
327	.58	Unfair tests	CTP
110	.52	Teachers lacking personality	CTP
Factor C.		Parent-student Conflicts	
197	.64	Clash of opinion between me and parents	HF
255	.61	Wanting more freedom at home	HF
196	.55	Unable to discuss certain problems at home	HF
142	.53	Home life unhappy	HF
Factor D.		Pressures of Time	
232	.53	Too little chance to enjoy nature	SRA
233	.52	Too little chance to pursue a hobby	SRA
286	.52	Too little chance to do what I want to do	SRA
234	.51	Too little chance to read what I like	SRA
Factor E.		Affectional Needs	
85	.59	Wondering if I'll ever find a suitable mate	CSM
306	.55	Wanting love and affection	HF
82	.52	Loving someone who doesn't love me	CSM
26	.51	Too few dates	CSM
Factor F.		Vocational Uncertainties	
213	.56	Needing to decide on an occupation	FVE
214	.56	Needing information about occupations	FVE
158	.51	Not knowing what I really want	FVE
215	.51	Needing to know my vocational abilities	FVE
Factor G.		Financial Problems	
65	.59	Too many financial problems	FLE
62	.58	Going through school on too little money	FLE

Table 5 (Continued)

Item No.	Factor Structure Weight		Mooney Category
Factor G.	(Continued)		
117	.53	Needing to watch every penny I spend	FLE
230	.53	Unsure of my future financial support	FLE
Factor H.	Neurasthenia		
58	.51	Occasional pressure and pain in my head	HPD
221	.50	Frequent headaches	HPD
131	.48	Unhappy too much of the time	PPR
296	.48	Too many personal problems	PPR
Factor I.	Indecision About Marriage and Sex		
136	.48	Being in love	CSM
81	.45	Afraid of losing the one I love	CSM
303	.42	Having to wait too long to get married	CSM
139	.39	Wondering if I really know my prospective mate	CSM
Factor J.	Distractions		
151	.39	Not spending enough time in study	ACW
206	.39	Not getting studies done on time	ACW
152	.37	Having too many outside interests	ACW
311	.37	Sometimes not being as honest as I should be	MR
Factor K.	Scholastic Problems		
41	.51	Not knowing how to study effectively	ACW
154	.50	Trouble in outlining or note taking	ACW
265	.45	Fearing failure in college	ACW
208	.44	Unable to express myself well in words	ACW
Factor L.	Religious Doubts with Depressive Tendencies		
40	.49	Doubting the value of worship and prayer	MR
93	.48	Don't know what to believe about God	MR
132	.44	Having memories of an unhappy childhood	PPR
299	.38	Sometimes bothered by thoughts of insanity	PPR
Factor M.	Religious and Cultural Aspirations		
202	.45	Wanting to understand more about the Bible	MR
203	.45	Wanting to feel close to God	MR
69	.44	Wanting to improve my mind	SRA
104	.44	Wanting part-time experience in my field	FVE

Table 6

Percentage Contribution of Mooney Categories to Factors

Category	Factor												
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	All Coefficients[a]												
HPD	7	7	6	8	6	5	7	11	3	8	4	5	8
FLE	4	8	8	11	6	8	21	8	7	9	4	7	7
SRA	12	8	9	21	13	10	9	9	3	6	11	10	12
SPR	17	7	10	7	13	9	7	11	12	10	11	11	9
PPR	15	9	11	8	12	9	10	16	;3	11	12	13	8
CSM	7	5	9	4	15	6	5	7	19	11	4	8	8
HF	7	7	17	5	9	6	9	9	10	8	4	10	8
MR	9	7	9	7	7	6	6	6	10	13	3	14	12
ACW	9	10	6	8	7	10	8	8	5	10	29	7	8
FVE	7	9	8	10	7	21	9	7	9	6	10	9	8
CTP	5	22	8	11	5	9	9	8	7	8	9	5	11
	All Coefficients $\geq$ .20[a]												
HPD	5	3	1	10	3	0	4	14	0	1	0	0	2
FLE	0	6	7	19	2	6	54	5	4	10	0	4	8
SRA	14	6	8	46	18	12	5	8	0	6	10	11	17
SPR	26	3	11	0	20	5	1	14	10	15	9	13	8
PPR	21	5	14	2	15	6	10	27	18	13	10	17	4
CSM	7	0	8	0	25	3	0	4	37	12	0	4	6
HF	4	3	35	0	9	3	10	9	7	7	0	10	9
MR	9	1	8	0	3	3	0	5	12	21	0	26	18
ACW	9	11	2	2	2	9	5	6	0	13	59	6	5
FVE	4	9	3	10	3	44	4	4	3	0	7	5	12
CTP	1	54	4	11	0	10	7	4	0	1	5	3	12

[a]All columns total 100 percent. Decimal points are omitted.

Table 7

Second-Order Factors Derived from 13 First-Order Factors of the Mooney[a]

Factor	Factor Structure Weight	First-Order Content
Factor I.		Emotional-Social-Scholastic Problems
E	69	Affectional needs
H	65	Neurasthenia
C	64	Parent-student conflicts
L	62	Religious doubts with depressive tendencies
A	59	Feelings of inferiority
G	55	Financial problems
K	55	Scholastic problems
F	53	Vocational uncertainties
Factor II.		Infirmity of Purpose
J	78	Distractions
I	72	Indecision about marriage and sex
Factor III.		Reach Exceeding Grasp
D	69	Pressures of time
B	68	College inequities
F	65	Vocational uncertainties
M	64	Religious and cultural aspirations

[a]Varimax/Promax rotations, k = 4.

Table 8

Significance Levels of Analysis of Variance of Responses in Factors by School, Class, Sex, Race, and Marital Status

Variable	Factor[a]												
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
School	.0158	.0019		.0001		.0058	.0001	.0001				.0231	.0001
Class	.0378	.0002				.0039					.0003		.0074
Sex				.0306									
Race													
Marital	.0368		.0006		.0001		.0191		.0002	.0193			.0072
Sex x Race													
Sex x Marital													
Race x Marital													
S x R x M													

[a]See Table 5 for identification of factors.